Automated Enterprise Applications Generation from Requirement Model

Yilong Yang
Department of Computer and Information Science
Faculty of Science and Technology
University of Macau
Email: yylonly@gmail.com

Xiaoshan Li
Department of Computer and Information Science
Faculty of Science and Technology
University of Macau
Email: xsl@umac.mo

arXiv:1609.09656v1 [cs.SE] 30 Sep 2016

***Abstract*—Notwithstanding the advancement of software engineering for enterprise applications, the process of software implementation is still time-consuming and error-prone. This situation is more severe when developing the custom software, because the requirements are always changing during the whole development processes. This issue could be alleviated by reusing exiting code or services in the private and public repositories. Nevertheless, the reuse could fail if no existing service is matched or existing services could not be composited to satisfy the requirements. Eventually, the developers have to implement the business logic manually for the un-satisfied requirements. In this paper, we present an approach which can automated generate business logic from requirement model for enterprise applications. Unlike other works, our approach does not need to specify design model such as sequence diagram, the business logic could be directly generated from operation contracts of requirement model. Operation contracts only contain the preconditions before executing the action, and the postconditions after execution. Moreover, the generated off-the-shelf code is adopted the same multi-layer structure as Java EE and .NET platforms which are robust, scalable, and widely used in enterprise application developments. Finally, a case study of library management system demonstrates the feasibility and efficiency of the proposed approach in our implemented RMCode tool.**

***Keywords*-code generation; enterprise applications; requirement model**

I. Introduction

Enterprise applications are about the display, manipulation, and storage of large amount of often complex data and the support or automation of business processes with that data [1]. Enterprise applications face the challenges in leverage the speed, security, scalable and reliability. That is the reason why the development platforms such as Java EE and .NET are widely adopted in enterprise application developments, which can provide a powerful set of APIs to shorten development time, reduce application complexity, and improve application performance. Although the platforms have already taken charge most complexity, developers still need to implement business logic manually. For example, when developer implements the business logic about *borrowBook* in Java EE platform[2], the code should like this:

```
@PersistenceContext
EntityManager em;
public Boolean borrowBook(int uid, int barcode) {
    User user = em.find(User.class, uid);
    BookCopy copy = em.find(BookCopy.class, barcode);

    Loan loan = new Loan();
    loan.setLoanedUser(user);
    loan.setLoanedCopy(copy);
    user.setLoanedNumber(user.getLoanedNumber() + 1);
    user.addLoanedBook(loan);
    copy.addLoanedRecord(loan);
    copy.setStatus(CopyStatus.LOANED);

    em.persist(loan);
    em.merge(copy);
    em.merge(user);
    return true;
}
```

For the design patterns of inversion of control[1] and dependency injection[2] first coined by Martin Fowler, entity manager of JPA (persistence layer in Java EE) takes charge of object responsibilities about finding(em.find), adding(em.persist), updating(em.merge), and deleting (em.remove). And entity manager could also be automatically injected into session beans (business layer in Java EE). The main task for developer is to use entity manager APIs to implement business logic. For the business logic of *borrowBook* above, the first step is to find the *User* and *BookCopy* instances through the input variables *uid* and *barcode*. The second step is to create a new instance *Loan*, set references among *user, copy, and loan*, update loaned number of this user, and set loaned status of this copy. The last step is to persist the corresponding objects *loan, user, and copy* to database.

As we known, the coding the above business logic is tedious, time-consuming and error-prone. For the project without complex business logic, developers may directly write code without explicitly making a design first. Otherwise, the design model should be presented first according requirement model, e.g sequence diagram, then developers write code according that design model. In order to improve this situation, [3] proposed sequence integration graph (SIG), which acts as a intermediate to help automatically generate business logic from sequence diagram. However, the experimental result shows that only less than 48% correct source code can be generated. MasterCraft [4] could generate enterprise applications from application layer model, user interaction model and database

[1]http://martinfowler.com/bliki/InversionOfControl.html
[2]http://martinfowler.com/articles/injection.html

layer model. Whereas, the business logic must be modeled first. AndroMDA[3] could generate J2EE and .NET enterprise applications. However, the auto-generated methods are only skeletons, the developers still need to implement business logic manually. To the best of our knowledge, the related work is all about generating business logic from design model or generating only skeletons. Can we make a further step to alleviate developer's workload **without** providing design model in advance, such as sequence diagram? In this paper, we propose an approach which can automatically generate Java EE liked business logic from requirement model for enterprise applications, and answered three research questions:

RQ1: *Could the business logic of enterprise application be automatically generated directly from requirement model without a explicit design model?* We analyse the business logic pattern in Java EE enterprise applications, choose the proper requirement model, and explicitly define the translation rules. Then consistent business logic can be generated from requirement model. **RQ2:** *What is the generation capacity or boundary of the proposed approach?* After solved RQ1, we need to figure out what kind of enterprise application can be generated, that means the generation boundary must be defined clearly.

Furthermore, a case study of library management system is demonstrated in the implemented tool RMCode, which has some features:

- *Bi-directionally synchronized graphic and textual requirement model:* RMCode provides both UML and an equivalent textual model to specify the requirements. RMCode take both advantages from graphic and textual models. Graphic model provides concrete visualization, which could be easy to communicate with non-technical stakeholders, and clear to show the relations among entities. Comparing to graphic model, textual requirement model could elaborately define the behaviour such as operation contract. and support modeling at any time without heavy CASE tool.
- *Automated generation off-the-shelf business layer and persistence layer:* RMCode can not only generate business logic, but also generate the whole business and persistence layers same as Java EE platform. Under the principles of separation of concerns [**?**], persistence layer focuses on conceptual domain, storage state and life-cycle management of the domain. Business layer is charged for business logic and provides API to presentation layer. Hence, the generated code could be directly invoked in GUI or wrapped as services to be integrated into other enterprise applications.
- *Supporting incremental requirement retrieved:* Requirement usually can not be precisely retrieved only one time. RMCode supports incremental requirement retrieving from different phases. In retrieved phase, behaviours of use cases are retrieved refering to actors involved in the system. In arrange phase, behaviours are arranged into different modules in the business layer. In specification phase, behaviours are precisely defined in each operation contract. Furthermore, those phases could be iterated in any epoch, and requirement could be immediately validated by generated code.

[3]http://andromda.sourceforge.net

The remainder of this paper is organised as follows: Section 2 overviews of our approach. Section 3 defines business logic generation from operation contract. Section 4 presents enterprise applications generation from requirement model, and then Section 5 provides the demonstration and performance analysis by the case study of library management system. Section 6 discusses the limitation related to RQ2. Section 7 discusses the related work, and finally, Section 8 concludes this paper and outlines the future work.

II. Overview

RQ1 refers to the overview of proposed approach, which is presented in Fig.1, business and persistence layers of enterprise applications could be automatically generated from requirement model, which contains use case diagram, conceptual class diagram, and operation contracts. The generated code could also validate the requirement model. Fig.1 involves the following three questions:



Fig. 1: RMCode Overview

1. Why we choose layered architecture like Java EE and .NET platform for enterprise application generation?

[5][1] shows layered architecture pattern is a solid general-purpose pattern, and usually a natural choice for enterprise application developments. Under the principle of separation of concerns, the responsibilities are separated into different isolation layers, and the number of layers depends on the complexity of target problem. The layered pattern makes high cohesion inside layer, low coupling between layers. This conforms general responsibility assignment software principles (GRASP) which consist of guidelines for assigning responsibility to classes and objects in object-oriented design [6]. And isolation of layers makes coupling even lower by supporting indirection pattern of GRASP. For example, a request of object changing from the presentation layer must first go through the business layer and then to the persistence layer. In addition, there are many mature platforms supporting this layered architecture pattern such as Java EE and .NET platforms. In those platforms, controller and pure fabrication patterns of GRASP is implemented in such EJB *manage bean* of Java EE for taking responsible for receiving or handling a event

from presentation layer. Furthermore, as the creator pattern of GRASP and factory pattern of GoF [7], entity manager take creating objects responsibility in the persistence layer. By the concept of inversion of control, instead of an entity object looking up, or deleting other entity object, entity manager take the those responsibilities into a charge. And all the dependencies such as the reference to entity manager could be automatically injected to other components in the same layer and the upper business layer by the implemented dependency injection pattern. Under the principles of GRASP, separation of concerns, design patterns of GoF, inversion of control, and dependency injection, layered architecture could make enterprise applications high cohesion and low counting, easy to implement, test, and maintain. From all above reasons, we choose layered architecture like Java EE and .NET platforms for enterprise application generation.

2. What is in the requirement model? This answer depends on what is generated from the requirement model. In Fig. 1, layered enterprise application is generated from the requirement model. The business logic in business layer can be retrieved after analysing the actors and use cases involved in the target problem. Therefore, use case diagram is included first in the requirement model. The business logic operates domain model to fulfill the business target. The domain model are implemented as entity classes in the persistence layer, which can be specified by conceptual class diagram in the requirement model. In our approach, we does not include any design model such as sequence diagram to specific business logic. However, the details description of system behaviour (business logic) are required to be specified in requirement model to generate code. Referring to the use-case model [6] within RUP, operation contract can precisely specify the system behaviour, the precondition of operation contract describes the system state before the executing this operation, the postcondition contract describe the state changes to objects in the domain model after this operation has executed. What is in the contract is the same description in the business logic for domain model. Therefore, the proposed approach contains use case diagram, conceptual class diagram and operation contracts in the requirement model.

3. How does the requirement model translate to code? According to the answer above, persistence layer of enterprise applications could be seamless generated: the conceptual class diagram can be directly translated to entity classes in persistence layer, and an entity manager is required to manage lifecycle of entity class. The main generation task for business layer is how to translate operation contracts to business logic, which invokes persistence layer APIs to operates domain model. The details of translation will be discussed late.

In the following sections, we analysed the business logic written in such as Java EE, summarised the code pattern of business logic. Then after comparing to the operation contracts, we will show how this contract translate to business logic.

III. Operation Contract to Business Logic

A. Analysing BorrowBook

In order to find code pattern in business logic, *borrowBook* written in Java EE is presented in Fig. 2 with operation contract.

As showed in the marked points, the instance *em* of entity manager is automated injected into business layer. Usually, entity manager is used to find objects (*user* and *copy* instances) first. After that, new objects (*loan* instance) may be created. If new objects is created, the references between new objects (*loan* instance) and exiting objects (*user* and *copy* instances) are required to be set. Then, the state of objects may be updated. If persistence is required, the new objects and changed objects should be persisted into database or other storage. Therefore, the main pattern of business logic is to find the existing objects, create the required new objects, set references and update state of objects.

The corresponding operation contract is in the right side of Fig. 2. All atomic actions of business logic have the corresponding representations in object constraint language (OCL)[4]. OCL is a standard contract description language in UML, and it is faultless, less mathematical background required and widely used in industry, e.g. IBM product line and the projects of the foundation of Eclipse. In the case of *borrowBook*, finding object is specified as an iteration operation (*any*) of OCL, e.g, all the instances of entity *User* has an instance its *UserID* is equal to input variable *uid*. Creating object is an standard operation *oclIsNew()* of OCL. Setting one-to-one reference is described as basic equal operation of OCL, e.g, the reference *LoanedUser* of instance *loan* is the instance *user*. Setting one-to-many reference is described as standard operations *include, includeAll, exclude, and excludeAll* of OCL, e.g, the references *LoanedBook* of instance *user* include the instance *loan*. Updating action is same as setting one-to-one reference but it could use previous state to describe present state, e.g, the number of loaned book plus 1 after *borrowBook* executed.

From the analysis, the relations between operation contract and business logic is clear, the business logic could be generated from operation contract. The details translation rules are presented in next sub section.

B. Translation Rules

OCL is abundant in grammatically mechanism to describe system state. In our case, OCL only need to describe the state for business logic in enterprise applications. After analysing the business logic, the business logic contains atomic actions such as finding object, setting reference, creating and delete object, and updating object. That conforms the well known CRUD (create,read,update, and delete) operations. The details of atomic actions and corresponding contracts are listed in Tab. I. There are 15 atomic actions, the taxonomy is based

[4]http://www.omg.org/spec/OCL/



Fig. 2: borrowBook in Java EE and Operation Contract

TABLE I: Translation Rules

CRUD	ReturnType	Atomic Action	OCL
Create	ob:Classifer	***createObject****(Classifer)*	*Pre: Classifer.allInstances()→excludes(ob)* *Post: ob.oclIsNew() and Classifer.allInstances()→includes(ob)*
Create	Boolean	***addOnetoManyAssociation****(ob:Classifer, asso:Attribute, addOb:Classifer)*	*Pre: ob.asso→excludes(addOb)* *Post: ob.asso→includes(addOb)*
Create	Boolean	***addOnetoOneAssociation****(ob:Classifer, asso:Attribute, addOb:Classifer)*	*Post: ob.asso = addOb*
Read	ob:Classifer	***findObject****(Classifer, obAttribute:Attribute, op::Operators, value:PrimeType)*	*ob:Classifer=Classifer.allInstances()→any(o|o.obAttribute op value)*
Read	obs:Set(Classifer)	***findObjects****(Classifer, obAttribute:Attribute, op::Operators, value:PrimeType)*	*obs:set(Classifer)=Classifer.allInstances()→select(o|o.obAttribute op value)*
Read	ob:Classifer	***findAssociationObject****(o:Classifer, asso:Attribute)*	o.asso
Read	obs:Set(Classifer)	***findAssociationObjects****(o:Classifer, asso:Attribute)*	o.asso
Read	Boolean	***standardOperationtoObject****(ob:Classifer, stanop::StandardOperation)*	ob.stanop
Read	Boolean	***standardOperationtoObjects****(obs:Set(Classifer), stancolop::StandardCollectionOperator)*	obs.stancolop
Read	Boolean	***checkAttributeState****(ob:Classifer, attri:Attribute, op::Operator, value:PrimeType)*	Pre: ob.attri op value
Read	Boolean	***checkObjectState****(ob:Classifer, stanop::StandardOperator, op::Operator, value:PrimeType)*	Pre: ob.stanop op value
Read	Boolean	***checkObjectState****(obs:Set(Classifer), stancolop::StandardCollectionOperator, op::Operator, value:PrimeType)*	Pre: obs.stancolop op value
Update	Boolean	***updateObject****(ob:Classifer, attri:Attribute, op::Operators, value:PrimeType)*	*Post: ob.attri = ob.attri@pre op value*
Update	Boolean	***updateObjectWithNew****(ob:Classifer, attri:Attribute, value:PrimeType)*	*Post: ob.attri = value*
Delete	Boolean	***releaseObject****(ob:Classifer)*	*Pre: Classifer.allInstances()→includes(ob)* *Post: Classifer.allInstances()→excludes(ob) and ob.oclIsUndefined() = true*
Delete	Boolean	***removeOnetoManyAssociation****(ob:Classifer, asso:Attribute, removeOb:Classifer)*	*Pre: ob.asso→includes(removeOb)* *Post: ob.asso→excludes(removeOb)*
Delete	Boolean	***removeOnetoOneAssociation****(ob:Classifer, asso:Attribute, removeOb:Classifer)*	*Post: ob.asso.oclIsUndefined() = true*

on CRUD. For the taxonomy of *create*, atomic actions contain *creatObject, addOnetoManyAssociation, addOnetoOneAssociation*. Atomic action *createObject* is generated when precondition specifies that object *ob* is excluded in all the instances of *Classifer*, and postcondition specifies that object *ob* is new object and included in all the instances of *Classifer*. The association has two situations, atomic action *addOnetoManyAssociation* is generated for one-to-many association when precondition specifies the association *asso* of object *ob* excludes object *addOb*, and postcondition specifies the association *asso* of object *ob* includes object *addOb*. Atomic action *addOnetoOneAssoication* is generated for one-to-one association when postcondition specifies the association *asso* of object *ob* is object *addOb*. This is all *create* taxonomy. The *read* actions may be specified in both pre and post conditions. The atomic actions *findObject* and *findObjects* are generated when the contract specifies selection any object *ob* or objects *obs* from all the instances of *Classifer* under the specific conditions. The conditions can be disjunction or conjunction together. The objects can be retrieved from association. Therefore, the actions *findAssociationObject* and *findAassociationObjects* could be generated when the contract specifies though object *o* and association *asso*. The state of object could be checked when the contract specifies the attribute *attri* of object *ob* with comparison operator *op* and value. The object and collection of objects can be invoked by standard operations such as *oclIsNew()* and *size()*. The actions *standardOperationtoObject* and *standardOperationtoObjects* could be

generated when the contract has specified. The state of the attribute of object, object or the collection of objects could be checked. That is *checkAttributeState, checkObjectState, and checkCollectionState* charged. This is all about *read* actions. For the updating object actions, actions *updateObjectWithNew* and *updateObject* are generated when the condition specifies that updating attribute *attri* of object *ob* is equal to some specified value or depends on the pervious state of this object. For the *delete* actions, they are opposite to *create* actions. E.g, the contract *ob.oclIsNew()* for creating object, the contract of deleting object is *ob.oclIsUndefined() = true*. This is all about the operation contract to the CRUD atomic actions. In the next part, we will show how does the generation algorithm make the translation rules work.

C. Business Logic Generation Algorithm

The operation contract contains input and output variables of operation, the operation can only be executed when the precondition is evaluated to *true*, postcondition is satisfied after operation execution. In order to redundancy, the common part of precondition and postcondition could be extracted to definition part of contract such as *findObject* and *findObjects*. The algorithm to generate business logic is listed in Alg. 1. Firstly, operation signature is generated by the input variables of operation contract. Then the common part of precondition and postcondition defined in definition of contract generate *findObject* and *findObjects* code. Moreover, like *if* command in Java, condition judgment skeleton is generated, the precondition generate code inside of condition judgment part, postcondition generate in the *then* part. In the *else* part, self-defined Java exception *PreconditionIsNotSatified* is generated to represent this exception will be thrown when precondition is not satisfied before the operation executing. For each atomic expression in precondition, *checkAttributeState* is generated if atomic expression is checking attribute state expression, *checkObjectState* is generated if atomic expression is checking object state expression, *checkColletionState* is generated if atomic expression is check collection state expression. For each atomic expression in postcondition, *createObject* is generated if the expression is create object expression, *addOnetoManyAssociation* is generated if the expression is to add one-to-many association, *addOnetoOneAssociation* is generated if the expression is to add one-to-one association. *updateObject* is generated if the expression is to update object expression based on previous state of object, *updateObjectWithNew* is generated if the expression is to update object not depends on the previous state of object. *releaseObject* is generated if the expression is to delete object, *removeOnetoManyAssociation* is generated if the expression is to remove the one-to-many association, *removeOnetoOneAssociation* is generated if the expression is to remove the one-to-one association. This is the algorithm about generation business logic from operation contract. Next subsection will show the case how this algorithm works for *borrowBook* contract.

Input : Operation Contract
Output: Business Logic
`// generation signature`
generate operation signature;
`// generation definition code`
for *all the selection operations in definition part* **do**
  if *operator is "any"* **then**
    generate *findObject* code;
  else
    generate *findObjects* code;
  end
end
`// generation contract skeleton`
generate conditional judgment skeleton;
`// generation precondition in skeleton`
for *all the atomic expression in precondition* **do**
  if *atomic expression is checking attribute* **then**
    generate *checkAttributeState* code;
  else if *atomic expression is checking object* **then**
    generate *checkObjectState* code;
  else
    generate *checkCollectionState* code;
  end
end
`// generation postcondition in skeleton`
for *all the atomic expression in postcondition* **do**
  switch *atomic expression* **do**
    case *create object expression*
      generate *createObject* code;
    case *add one to many association expression*
      generate *addOnetoManyAssociation* code;
    case *add one to one association expression*
      generate *addOnetoOneAssociation* code;
    case *update object expression by previous state*
      generate *updateObject* code;
    case *update object expression*
      generate *updateObjectWithNew* code;
    case *delete object expression*
      generate *releaseObject* code;
    case *remove one to many association expression*
      generate *removeOnetoManyAssociation* code;
    case *remove one to one association expression*
      generate *removeOnetoOneAssociation* code;
  endsw
end

Algorithm 1: Business Logic Generation



Fig. 3: Business Logic Generation: borrowBook

D. Example: Borrowing Book

The complete contract of borrow book is presented in Fig. 3. The reason why we choose this operation is *borrowbook* involves main entities of library management system, the executing path depends on other objects state such as student state, borrowing state, and reservation state. This is most important and complex operation in library management system. The inputs of *borrowBook* are *uid* of entity *user* and *barcopy* of entity *copy*. In the definition part, *uid* and *barcopy* are used to find instances of *User*, *BookCopy* and *Reserve*. There are two main successful executing paths: The one is user reserved this copy, then borrows this copy. The other is the user directly borrows this copy without any reservation. In any circumstance, the instances of *user* and *copy* must be validated before executing, which are defined in precondition. The status of *user* must be normal, not suspended and loaned number is not exceeded the specific number (Bachelor 20, Master 40, PhD students and teacher 60). In the first executing path, the *copy* must be reserved and on the hold shelf, the person who reserved this copy must be himself, that will make the instance of *reserve* valid, and the property *isReservedClosed* of instance of *reserve* must be false. On the another path, the user can directly borrow this copy when the status of copy is available. After borrowed this copy, an instance of *loan* is created, the property *LoanDate* is set as the date of today, *DueDate* is set as today after specific days corresponding to whether this user is student or not. The associations among this *loan*, *user* and *copy* are linked. The loaned number of user is plus one. If the user is in the first executing path, the property *isReserved* of copy instance is false, and the property *isReservedClosed* of reserve instance is true. Finally, the status of copy is *CopyStatus::LOANED*.

The above is all the precondition and postcondition of borrowing book. After running Alg. 1, the result is showed in Fig. 3. Firstly, operation signature is generated with input and output variables. The *fingObject* code for the specific user with the same *uid* of input variable is generated. Unlike Java EE entity manager provided *find* method, which can only find the object according to the key property, our entity manager could be adapted for the different domain model, get all the instances of specific entity, then find the desired instance according any property of entity. Then the precondition part of contract is translated into the conditional judgement inside of *if* command, E.g, the *checkObjectState* is generated to check whether the found instances *user* and *copy* are undefined or not. All the standard operations are implemented in *StandardOPs* class, because of the limitations of space, we can not mention too much here. You can download and check from our update site. For the *checkAttributeState* marked in the figure, the master student can not loan book beyond or equal to 40, the

code is generated accordingly. After all atomic expressions of precondition are translated, postcondition translation will start. According to the contract, a new instance *loan* is created, the *createObject* code is generated by invoking the *createObject* API of entity manager. As we known, the association from the entity *loan* to *copy* is one-to-one (One loaned record belongs to only one copy). Therefore, the *addOneToOneAssociation* code is generated by invoking set operation *setLoanedCopy* of entity *loan*. And the association from the entity *copy* to *loan* is one-to-many (One copy could has multiple loaned records). Hence, the *addOneToManyAssociation* is generated by invoking the add operation of entity *copy*. For the updating action, E.g, after borrowed the copy, the copy status must be as *LOANED*. We use `::` to represent enum type. For the copy state is *loaned*, the enum *CopyStatus* is the value of *CopyStatus::LOANED*. The corresponding *updateObjectWithNew* code is generated to set the state of *copy* as *CopyStatus::LOANED*. For the loaned number, the value must plus 1 based on previous loaned number, the *updateObject* code is generated to get previous loaned value first, then set the value as previous value plus 1. That is the all code generated from contract for borrowBook by Alg. 1.

In the next section, we will show the meta model of requirement model, persistence layer of the requirement model, how does persistence layer generate from that requirement model.

IV. Requirement Model to Enterprise Applications

In the previous section, the generation business logic from operation contract is presented. However, the operation contracts can not be directly retrieved from target domain. The requirement model are needed to support retrieving requirements incrementally and iteratively. In this section, the requirement model implemented in RMCode are presented. Business logic is already generated from operation contract, business layer contain all the generated business logic and arrange them into services. The last generation work is to generate persistence layer from the conceptual model of requirement model. Then the enterprise applications with generated layers can provides service to other layers (e.g. GUI layer).

A. Requirement Model

To support both graphic and textual requirement model, and bi-directionally synchronization, the meta model need to be present first. Then mapping each elements in two model to the same meta model. Requirement should be obtained incrementally. Usually, starting from participated actors in the system, use cases are obtained according to the actors, service is used to arrange operations mapped from use cases, conceptual model is to construct data structure of the system. Operation is precisely defined by contract. Therefore, requirement model should include at least following parts: actor with use cases, service to arrange operations, conceptual model to capture conceptual domain, contract of operations. The requirement model proposed in our tool RMCode is showed in Fig 5. For the graphic model, actor with use cases can be represented as use case diagram, conceptual model can be described as conceptual class diagram. However, graphic is not good for specifying the operation contract, the textual model is a good supplementation for this shortage. Therefore,



Fig. 5: Requirement model in RMCode

using both graphic model and textual model are a good way to retrieve requirements effectively and correctly.

B. Enterprise Application

Our target is to generate two layers of enterprise application. The business logic is already generated by Alg. 1. The two remaining work are generate business logic by arranging business logic into services and generate persistence layer from conceptual model. The target is showed in Fig. 6. The



Fig. 6: Enterprise Applications

business logic about searching book are arranged into search service, the business logic about book circulation are arranged into book service. For the persistence layer, each entity in the conceptual model is generated to entity class in the persistence layer. For all entities, entity manager is generated for provide the basic function to the business logic, which has been



Fig. 4: The Meta Model of Requirement Model

discussed in pervious section. For now, we need a algorithm to make all pieces together, which is showed in Alg. 2. The persistence layer is generated first by generated all entity classes and entity manager. And then the business layer is generated by invoking Alg. 1 and arrange the business logic into corresponding services.

Input : Requirement Model
Output: Enterprise Applications
`// generation persistence layer`
`// generation entity class`
for *all the entity in conceptual model* **do**
  generate entity class code;
end
`// generation entity manager`
generate entity manager;
`// generation business layer`
`// generation business logic`
for *all operation contract* **do**
  executing algorithm 1;
end
`// generation services`
generate skeleton services;
`// generation business logic`
for *all generated business logic* **do**
  generate services code into corresponding services code;
end

Algorithm 2: Enterprise Application Generation

In the next section, the proposed approach is demonstrated on the whole case study of library management system to analyse the performance.

V. Performance

The case study of library management system is throughout this paper. It is a well known case study. For the business logic generation, we only show the operation *BorrowBook*. For purpose of validation effectiveness the proposed approach and tool, the more use case should be presented. The core use cases are makeReservation, borrowBook, returnBook, renewBook and checkOverDue with compute over due fee in which third part services will be invoked in some situations. For the case of renewBook, the borrowed book only could be renewed when there is no reservation on it, renew time must be before the due date, and for the different users such as student and teacher, bachelor and master students, the renew times and the holding time are totally different.

We compared each operation with the measurement of LOC (line of code), the number of atomic actions (AA), generation time (GT), and execution time (ET). Our experiment is running on the normal desktop, with 3.5 GHz Intel Core i5, 16 GB 1600 MHz DDR3, and 500 GB Flash Storage. The result is showed in Tab. II. The first impression of our approach is very effective. The generation time is all under 10ms. The generation time and execution time are the average of three times of experiments. The *borrowBook* is most complex business logic in library management system, it has 70 lines of code, 44 atomic actions contained. Even though, the generation time is only 8.54247 ms, and the execution time is 525.34686 ms under 1ms, because the precondition contain nested paths, that take more time to check. The main use case contain the average of 20 atomic actions, that demonstrate our approach has the capability to apply to other enterprise applications. For now, **RQ1** can answer here: Yes, enterprise applications could be automatically and effectively generated from requirement model. However, there are some limitations in our approach. **RQ2** will be discussed in the next section.

VI. Limitation

For operation contract aspect, RMCode could generate code from the specification written in Tab. I. In addition, RMCode supports *if, let* grammar of OCL. Third-parts APIs is also supported in our requirement model. However, if you write

TABLE III: The Comparison of Code Generation Tools

Name	Requirement Model (UML)	Open Source	Organization	OCL Support	Code Generation
Rational Rose Family	√		IBM	Supported	Java/C#/C++ Entity Class
MagicDraw	√		No Magic	(Dresden OCL) 2.3	Java/C#/C++ Entity Class
Enterprise Architect	√		Sparx Systems	Supported	Java/C#/C++ Entity Class
Visual Paradigm	√		Visual Paradigm	No	Entity Class with ORM / REST API supported
Papyrus UML	√	√	Eclipse Foundation	(Eclipse OCL) 2.4	Java Entity Class
UML Designer	√	√	Obeo Network	(Eclipse OCL) 2.4	Java Entity Class
Eclipse Modeling Project		√	Eclipse Foundation	(Eclipse OCL) 2.4	GUI (EMF Forms)/ Entity Class with ORM (EMF/CDO)
USE	√		Bremen University	Supported	No
rCOS modeler	√		UM and UNU-IIST	No	No
AutoPA			UM and UNU-IIST	(Octopus) 2.0	OO Code

TABLE II: The results of library management system

UseCase	LOC	AA	GT(ms)	ET(ms)
searchBookByBarCode	27	4	9.82555	0.22312
searchBookByTitle	23	4	1.00725	0.45902
searchBookByAuthor	23	4	0.7482	0.64243
searchBookByISBN	23	4	1.25654	0.24375
searchBookBySubject	27	4	1.96138	0.54212
addBook	14	3	3.32883	1.42486
deleteBook	29	8	9.03951	1.42464
recommendBook	28	12	2.94632	1.43221
queryBookCopy	24	3	1.21512	1.34528
addBookCopy	27	11	2.06911	9.62374
deleteBookCopy	25	7	1.20971	1.75343
makeReservation	41	17	3.43437	0.19412
cannelReservation	46	19	2.68532	0.45594
borrowBook	70	44	8.54247	525.34686
renewBook	67	32	6.02692	0.46449
returnBook	65	25	4.17085	0.94083
payOverDueFee	39	14	7.69423	0.62023
listBorrowHistory	15	6	3.97312	0.65607
listHoldingBook	34	7	6.79587	1.44897
listOverDueBook	41	10	3.98236	1.31842
listReservationBook	34	9	4.69292	0.71341
listRecommendBook	28	7	1.65816	0.86342
checkOverDueDayAndFee	53	40	7.98976	2.35364
dueSoonNotification	33	8	3.35992	0.43919
countDownSuspensionDay	31	11	4.29009	0.24055
createUser	14	3	0.94726	57.87105
deleteUser	25	6	0.94145	2.34123
queryUser	25	4	0.65654	1.23412
createLibrarian	15	3	0.41938	1.35931
deleteLibrarian	25	6	0.71815	1.02476
queryLibrarian	25	5	0.74347	0.55311

precondition and postcondition as an equation, our approach can not generated write code for you, you should explicitly show how to update this object.

For enterprise applications aspect, this paper focuses on generating business logic. The object state could be persistence into the file, we don't take database into account in this time. That is all **RQ2** care about.

VII. Related Work

Commercial tools usually support automated code generation. Except Visual Paradigm (VP) [8] in Tab.III, most of them support OCL-based contract, entity class can be automated generated as multiple programming language, but VP supports entity class generation with ORM supported and provided Restful-based web service wrapper, Papyrus UML[9] is well developed and widely used open source tool by Eclipse foundation. Furthermore, under eclipse modelling projects, EMF Forms[5] supports GUI automated generation from domain model, CDO[6] provides the ability to support ORM in EMF[7] model. The new version of Enterprise Architect support generate business logic from design model (e.g sequence diagram). However, like the related works mentioned in the introduction section, all the commercial tools can not generate business logic without explicitly a design model.

For automated composition of service computing, the survey [10][11] provide the overview of this approaches. There are two primary paradigms for service composition: top-down and bottom-up paradigms [12]. For top-down paradigm, the complex workflow is designed manually, and bottom-up paradigm can composite services automatically by AI method. [13] presents a mixture paradigm architecture, unlike top-down paradigm, HTN to plan workflow is utilized instead of designed workflow, and like top-down paradigm to discover services, the best service is selected. If no existed service is matched, same as bottom-up paradigm, the nested composition procedure will be triggered to fulfil the requirement. Nevertheless, full automatic approaches usually are not the best solution for world-wild problems. Especially for human dominant activities. Therefore, [14] presents an modified mixture composition paradigm, which combines top-down and bottom-up paradigms by designing a workflow for discovering and selecting service foremost, when no service is matched or discovered, a bottom-up nested composition procedure

[5]http://www.eclipse.org/ecp/emfforms
[6]http://www.eclipse.org/cdo/
[7]https://eclipse.org/modeling/emf/

will be triggered. Nevertheless, the automated generation of service workflow would be failure if no one existing service is matched or existing services could not be composed to satisfy the requirements.

The advantages of academic tools are supported by well formed mathematic. USE (UML-based Specification Environment) [15] supports analysts, designers and developers in executing UML models and checking OCL constraints and thus enables them to employ model-driven techniques for software production. rCOS (Refinement of Component and Object Systems) modeler [16][17][18] is supported refinement calculus both of component-based and object-oriented model. It uses first-order logic to specification the contracts of operations. However, those tools do not support generate any code and prototype, AutoPA (Automated Prototype Generation and Analysis) [19][20] could generate business logic from OCL Specification and Java swing prototype. but both rCOS and AutoPA are not separate logic responsibilities from entity class, generation business logic only from precondition or postcondition, and AutoPA does not support textual requirement model.

VIII. Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we propose an approach which could automated generated enterprise applications from requirement model without explicitly design model, which is implemented as eclipse plugin named RMCode, a classic case study of library management system demonstrates the feasibility and efficiency. The tool supports the phase-based incremental requirement modeling. After acquiring requirement model, layered enterprise application could be automated generated without any effort. The new requirements could be easily added, then enterprise applications can be regenerated immediately, this approach could be useful for requirement engineer to find right requirement and boost the process of software development.

In the future, we will continue to enhance RMCode to support more enterprise application layers such database layer, and for the operation contract, we will take the more general case into account such as equation.

References

[1] M. Fowler, *Patterns of enterprise application architecture*. Addison-Wesley Longman Publishing Co., Inc., 2002.

[2] E. Jendrock, R. Cervera-Navarro, I. Evans, K. Haase, and W. Markito, *The Java EE 7 Tutorial*. Addison-Wesley Professional, 2014, vol. 1.

[3] D. Kundu, D. Samanta, and R. Mall, "Automatic code generation from unified modelling language sequence diagrams," *IET Software*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 12–28, 2013.

[4] V. Kulkarni, R. Venkatesh, and S. Reddy, "Generating enterprise applications from models," in *International Conference on Object-Oriented Information Systems*. Springer, 2002, pp. 270–279.

[5] M. Richards, *Software Architecture Patterns*. OReilly, Sebastopol, 2015.

[6] C. Larman, *Applying UML and Patterns: An Introduction to Object Oriented Analysis and Design and Interative Development*. Pearson Education India, 2012.

[7] E. Gamma, *Design patterns: elements of reusable object-oriented software*. Pearson Education India, 1995.

[8] V. Paradigm, "Visual paradigm for uml," *Visual Paradigm for UML-UML tool for software application development*, 2013.

[9] A. Lanusse, Y. Tanguy, H. Espinoza, C. Mraidha, S. Gerard, P. Tessier, R. Schnekenburger, H. Dubois, and F. Terrier, "Papyrus uml: an open source toolset for mda," in *Proc. of the Fifth European Conference on Model-Driven Architecture Foundations and Applications*. Citeseer, 2009, pp. 1–4.

[10] J. Rao and X. Su, "A survey of automated web service composition methods," in *Semantic Web Services and Web Process Composition*. Springer, 2004, pp. 43–54.

[11] S. Dustdar and W. Schreiner, "A survey on web services composition," *International journal of web and grid services*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1–30, 2005.

[12] P. Bartalos and M. Bieliková, "Automatic dynamic web service composition: A survey and problem formalization," *Computing and Informatics*, vol. 30, no. 4, pp. 793–827, 2012.

[13] I. Paik, W. Chen, and M. N. Huhns, "A scalable architecture for automatic service composition," *Services Computing, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 82–95, 2014.

[14] Y. Yang, J. Yang, X. Li, and W. Wang, "An integrated framework for semantic service composition using answer set programming," *International Journal of Web Services Research (IJWSR)*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 47–61, 2014.

[15] M. Gogolla, F. Büttner, and M. Richters, "Use: A uml-based specification environment for validating uml and ocl," *Science of Computer Programming*, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 27–34, 2007.

[16] Z. Liu, H. Jifeng, and X. Li, "rcos: Refinement of component and object systems," in *Formal Methods for Components and Objects*. Springer, 2005, pp. 183–221.

[17] H. Jifeng, X. Li, and Z. Liu, "rcos: A refinement calculus of object systems," *Theoretical computer science*, vol. 365, no. 1, pp. 109–142, 2006.

[18] W. Ke, X. Li, Z. Liu, and V. Stolz, "rcos: a formal model-driven engineering method for component-based software," *Frontiers of Computer Science*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 17–39, 2012.

[19] D. Li, X. Li, J. Liu, and Z. Liu, "Validation of requirement models by automatic prototyping," *Innovations in systems and software engineering*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 241–248, 2008.

[20] X. Li, Z. Liu, M. Schaf, and L. Yin, "Autopa: automatic prototyping from requirements," in *Leveraging Applications of Formal Methods, Verification, and Validation*. Springer, 2010, pp. 609–624.